IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.GIRI

TUESDAY, THE 30TH OCTOBER 2007 / 8TH KARTHIKA 1929

WP(C).No. 28674 of 2007(L)

PETITIONER:

SUJATHA.G.,
RAJA MANDIRAM,FORT, MAVELIKARA,
ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.K.SASIKUMAR

RESPONDENTS:

1. THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,PATTOM,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE DISTRICT OFFICER
KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
ALAPPUZHA.

3. STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT
PERSONNEL & ADMINISTRATIVE
REFORMS (RULES)
DEPARTMENT GOVERNMENT OF KERALA,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

R1 & R2 BY ADV. SRI.ALEXANDER THOMAS,SC,KPSC
R3 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.BEJOY CHANDRAN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 30/10/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

V.GIRI, J.

W.P.(C).No.28674 of 2007 L

Dated this the 30th day of October, 2007.

JUDGMENT

In terms of Ext.P4 notification issued by the Public Service Commission inviting applications for the post of L.D.Typist in various departments (appointment by transfer) the petitioner also applied. One of the prescribed qualifications was Typewriting English (L) K.G.T.E. and computer word processing. Though the petitioner admittedly does not possess the prescribed qualification as per the notification, according to her, she had completed a course computer word processing in M.S. Word from one Information Technology Centre as evidenced by Ext.P1 dated 15.12.2005. According to the petitioner, therefore, it should be treated as an equivalent qualification. I am afraid I cannot accept the said submission.

2. Public Service Commission has subsequently, as per Ext.P8 order, declared that a course in computer word processing for not less than 3 months conducted by government department, government agencies and University may be treated as

equivalent qualification. The course undergone by the petitioner, as evidenced by Ext.P1, does not fall under any of the categories.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner then refers to Ext.P2, which shows that the petitioner had passed Typewriting English (L) K.G.T.E. and computer word processing in September, 2006 and since equivalent qualifications were declared by the Public Service Commission only on 15.12.2006, the acquisition of the qualification before the date of Ext.P8 should be treated as sufficient, it is contended.

3. I am afraid this also cannot be accepted. In Ext.P8 the Public Service Commission has only made a declaration of certain qualifications as equivalent to the prescribed qualifications. But possession of the said qualification by the concerned applicant must be found out with reference to the last date of receipt of the application. That is to say, the acquisition of the qualification subsequent to the last date of receipt of the application cannot be treated as sufficient for the purpose of the notification in question.

For all these reasons, the writ petition is bereft of merits and the same is dismissed.

Sd/-
(V.GIRI)
JUDGE

sk/

//true copy//

P.S. To Judge